

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, JUNE, 1908.

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, 24 Concord Ave., Cambridge.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Thirty-five Branch Committees; 14,163 members in 945 cities, towns, and villages.

MRS. G. HOWLAND SHAW, President.
MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN, Dean of
Radcliffe College,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,
Walnut Street, Brookline,
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON,
Recording Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y,
24 Concord Ave., Cambridge.

Vice-Presidents.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION.

THE Association held its annual meeting at 77 Mt. Vernon St. The President, Mrs. G. Howland Shaw, who was unable to be present, sent a message of welcome to the members of the Association, expressing her keen interest in the work and her appreciation of what had been done during the year.

At her request, Mrs. James M. Codman presided, and introduced Miss Elizabeth Johnson, the Recording Secretary, who presented the Annual Report, a portion of which is here given:

Report of the Recording Secretary.

Questions various in kind and of more or less importance have been

settled during the past year, and the sum of human happiness has been thereby increased. The problem of Woman Suffrage, however, is still with us. Our Suffrage sisters in this country as in Europe still labor indefatigably in the furtherance of their purpose of adding political responsibilities to the already complicated life of the modern woman. Anti-Suffragists, meanwhile, believing that Suffrage, whether for men or women, implies duties to be performed rather than privileges to be enjoyed, and that the average woman can better serve country, state, and community by the more efficient fulfillment of present obligations than by entrance into fields of political activity, continue their chosen work of "opposing the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women."

During the months that have passed since our last annual meeting the activities of this Association, have made progress along three definite lines. With the coöperation of our members it has been possible materially to increase our membership, now numbering over fourteen thousand; the quarterly issue of the REMONSTRANCE, passing the experimental stage, has become an established fact, and the more widespread and frequent dissemination of anti-suffrage opinion thus made possible cannot fail to increase the interest and number of our friends; and a third forward step has been the opening of a room for our work, where at stated times literature and information relative to Anti-Suffrage interests and happenings may be obtained.

A number of meetings have been held in cities and towns throughout the state, special effort being made to obtain hearings in communities not heretofore reached by our movement; and literature has been widely distributed — thousands of miscellaneous pieces, with 24,000 copies of the June, October, January, and April issues of the REMONSTRANCE, carrying our message to all parts of the country.

This year's record of legislative events in Massachusetts relating to Woman Suffrage is brief but satisfactory. Two bills have come before the legislature. One of these provided for Municipal Suffrage for all

women on the same terms as men, the other for Municipal Suffrage for tax-paying women, the latter it should be noted being a bill exclusively favoring the moneyed class, — class legislation pure and simple, — the bringing in of which by those accustomed to urge Woman Suffrage on the ground that every mature human being of sound mind has a divine right to vote, would suggest either an unconscious vein of humor or a deficient supply of logic on the part of the petitioners.

On Tuesday, February 4, the Election Laws Committee granted a hearing on the two bills in question, a large and interested audience being in attendance. The petitioners presented their accustomed arguments — the remonstrants were well represented by several speakers, with Charles R. Saunders, Esq., counsel for our Association, Mr. Saunders' analysis of the "Municipal Suffrage for Taxpaying Women" Bill was especially able and instructive. Not only was it objectionable as class legislation, but its provision to give the Suffrage to taxpaying women because they, being property holders, pay taxes, was without logical justification in this country, where there is no connection whatever between property holding and the right to vote — men with large property having but one vote and standing exactly in the same position in this respect as men with small property or men with no property at all. As for our forefathers' maxim, "No taxation without representation," so frequently misapplied by the suffragists in support of theories which, if presented to them, our forefathers would have been among the first to condemn, — it merely meant that the Colonies, having no one present in Parliament to state their needs, could not, therefore with justice be taxed by England, and had no reference to principles governing the local taxation of individuals.

The committee subsequently reported "leave to withdraw" on both bills — 8 to 3 against the full Municipal Suffrage Bill, and 9 to 2 against the Bill for Municipal Suffrage for Taxpaying Women. On February 26 in the House, the Municipal Suffrage Bill was defeated, 30 to 99, and the

Taxpaying Municipal Suffrage Bill rejected *viva voce*.

The senate later accepted the adverse reports without debate and without a division.

From the New York and Illinois Anti-Suffrage associations, new and excellent reading matter has come to us, and current magazines have supplied a number of interesting articles embodying our views.

The formation of study classes for the reading and discussion of Anti-Suffrage literature is a recent development of our work worthy of special commendation. Never has there been more evident need than at present for constructive thought and clear expression on our part. The generalities of the advocates of woman suffrage have never been so many or so glittering. Their siren calls to public service, in which women without trouble or exertion on their own part are to accomplish beneficent and sweeping reforms, have never been so alluring or their portrayal of the political situation, with stay-at-home voters and masculine corruption and incompetency, so flatteringly suggestive of the part woman might play in public affairs if given the opportunity.

Our answer must be ready and to the point, placing over against the generalities which glitter the sober facts of the everyday life of the everyday woman,—its duties and responsibilities,—the calls upon time and strength within the home, the outside calls of church and charity and social life, the sustained and exhausting effort of the self-supporting woman.

To the call to Public Service as woman's duty, we reply that Public Service may be rendered in many ways—without, as well as with, the ballot. And the Anti-Suffragist movement stands for the belief that women can as a whole best serve the state without it, the average woman giving her full time and strength to her daily duties and the manifold problems growing out of them—the women with time and ability for public work becoming, in increasing numbers we trust, an active and efficient non-partisan influence in public affairs.

It is but too true that many men fail in the performance of their political duties, but the remedy proposed, that women should become a continuous factor in politics, for which beside having unsolved problems of their own they are by nature and by training manifestly unfitted, seems scarcely adequate,—reminding one indeed of a

scene in Punch some years ago, "Road-Building in the East," in which the sergeant calling to the corporal in charge of the gang of workers, "How many men have ye up there, corporal?" and being answered "Well, sir, about a dozen, but they're doing nothing," says reassuringly, "Wait a bit, then, and I'll send up another dozen to lend a hand."

The close of this, the twelfth year of its work, finds the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women in a condition auguring well for future growth and achievement.

Equipped with a substantial membership, improved business methods, an earnest and enthusiastic Executive Committee, well planned sub and branch committees, and a Standing Committee of 327—women of influence and intelligence representing all parts of this state—we count to-day as the best in our history. Let us hope that to-morrow will be even better, bringing more money, more workers, a purpose more clearly defined—capacity to do a larger work.

The Treasurer's report followed.

Miss L. C. Post, chairman of the Organization Committee, gave an account of the greatly increased strength and growth of the Association; and the chairmen of the Boston, Cambridge, and Framingham branch committees described the work accomplished in their different localities. Officers and Executive Committee for the year were elected as follows:

President, Mrs. G. Howland Shaw; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, dean of Radcliffe College, and Mrs. Henry M. Whitney; Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman; Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong; Executive Committee, the officers and Miss Mary S. Ames, Miss Sarah H. Crocker, Mrs. Gorham Dana, Miss Katharine E. Guild, Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, Miss Sarah E. Hunt, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Miss L. C. Post, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, Mrs. R. M. Saltonstall, Miss E. P. Sohler, Mrs. Henry M. Thompson.

The meeting was concluded by an address by F. Spencer Baldwin, Ph.D., professor of Economics in Boston University, on "The American Woman

and Her Critics." The following is a brief abstract:

The American Woman and Her Critics.

The speaker gave a résumé of recent criticism of the American woman by Mrs. Anna A. Rogers, George Bernard Shaw, G. B. M. Harvey, John Corbin, and other writers. "The composite portrait of the American woman as drawn by her recent critics," he continued, "looks about like this: The American woman is an all-round failure, both before and after marriage. She is 'idle,' 'selfish,' 'extravagant,' 'superficial,' 'discursive,' 'restless,' 'cowardly,' 'shirking,' 'greedy,' 'pampered,' 'spoiled,' 'parasitic,' 'capricious,' 'imperious,' 'tyrannical,' 'brazen,' 'aggressive,' 'loud-voiced,' 'hard-featured,' 'conscienceless,' 'heartless,' 'without sex,' and 'without humor.'

"This arraignment is obviously somewhat overdrawn. If the American woman were really as bad as she is represented to be, the American nation would be already in hopeless dotage. It is noticeable that the critics have nothing but words of praise for the American man, but the American man is the product of the American woman. It would seem that there must be at least a saving remnant of unspoiled womanhood in this country to produce the much-lauded American man.

"The fact of the matter is that the great majority of American women have not been seriously affected by the vicious tendencies of character and deportment emphasized by the critics. The latter have simply generalized certain aberrant feminine traits—observable chiefly in particular circles of American society and conspicuous only in abnormal types of American womanhood—into a general indictment of the sex. But it is as hazardous to draw up an indictment against a whole sex as it is against a whole people.

"The worst things which have been said of the American woman hold true only of the 'show girl' type, aptly characterized by Mr. Corbin's phrase, 'the American drone.' Mr. Corbin, although confused in his apiological terminology, is right in his sociological diagnosis of this type. The prevalent illustrations which set the style for the American drone depict a creature of superb physical beauty, enhanced by effective sartorial setting; but met in the flesh, this Gibsonized American girl is usually found to be lacking in the subtler

qualities of mind and heart that make up the eternal feminine. She is often intellectually shallow and affected, morally obtuse and selfish. She has commonly acquired social veneer at a finishing school, which means, according to the recent confession of a teacher in one of these schools, merely an ability to chatter superficially about current topics and about people, a memory for who's who in America, and the power, perhaps, to conceive a social entertainment. The word drone fitly denotes the relation of this swagger nonentity to human society. She is merely a gorgeous parasite; she does nothing worth while herself, nor does she help any man, whether father, brother, or husband, to do his work in the world. Unfortunately, however, it is by this spurious type that American women are judged by foreigners and others who do not know. For it is the type conspicuously in evidence in the current productions of playwrights, novelists, and illustrators, while in the background, out of the limelight, stands unnoticed the real American woman, the American queen.

"The solid basis of truth underlying all the criticism of the American woman is the contention that the old-fashioned domestic ideal of self-effacing, self-sacrificing womanhood has been eclipsed by the rise of a new anti-domestic ideal of self-assertive, self-centered womanhood. It cannot be denied that the home no longer possesses the significance which it once had for the feminine imagination and ambition; the emancipation of woman has opened to her many opportunities for a career outside the home. No one but a purblind reactionary obsessed by gynophobia would deny that this widening of woman's field of activity and interest has brought great social gain, but it is equally clear to the calm-minded observer that the feminist movement unless carefully guided and kept within proper bounds involves grave dangers to society. The dangers to be apprehended are the tendency to race suicide, the increase of divorce, and the feminization of culture."

The speaker dwelt upon each of these tendencies, emphasizing especially the last, concerning which he said: "If the feminine element becomes the dominant and controlling force in the cultural life and growth of the nation, the result will be most unfortunate. It is distinctly desirable, in the interest of a broad, sane, and vigorously progressive national culture that its character and develop-

ment should be shaped, guided, and stamped by men. A national culture dominated and directed by women will inevitably take on the imprint of the feminine characteristics.

"The apprehension which has been expressed concerning the unfortunate effects of a gynocracy of culture implies an assumption that the feminine characteristics in question will persist in the future; that they will not disappear with the progress of the sex. The movement for the equalization of the sexes, economic, social and political, is regarded by those who hold this view as a senseless and hopeless attempt to overturn the natural order of things, founded on the broad differences which distinguish the two sexes. Recently, however, a new thesis of sex equality has been proposed, which if established and accepted, would cut the ground from under the opponents and critics of the feminist movement. The thesis is set forth in Dr. Emmet Densmore's recent book, 'Sex Equality.'

"Dr. Densmore argues that the present differences between the sexes in respect to physical strength, intellectual qualities, and emotional characteristics, are not constitutional, fundamental, and essential. They result from environment and heredity. Place the two sexes under the same conditions, by giving woman full equality of opportunity with man as regards education and occupation, and the distinction between male and female traits will disappear. Woman will become as mathematical, logical, philosophical, and inventive as man, while man will become as intuitive, sensitive, refined, and spiritual as woman."

The speaker criticised this doctrine of sex equality as inconceivable, because the qualities that are to be united in the new androgynous hybrid conceived by Dr. Densmore are mutually incompatible and irreconcilable; as impossible of realization, because it pre-supposes complete abdication by women of the function of motherhood; and as unattractive to contemplate even as an unattainable ideal, because it implies the disappearance of the womanly woman, the annihilation of the eternal feminine.

The speaker concluded: "Dismissing this absurd theory of sex equality we must hold to the traditional doctrine of sex differentiation. The existence of natural and ineradicable differences of organization on the part of the sexes has brought about an appropriate and economical separation of functions, or division of labor,

between them which may be expected to endure in the future. The peculiarities of woman's constitution fit her for some tasks and unfit her for others. The sphere of woman's activity as marked out for her by nature can never be made to coincide with that of man. In all that is done for the emancipation and education of woman this central truth should be kept steadily in view. The ideal toward which we should strive is not sex equality and competition, but sex differentiation and coöperation, making for the highest possible development of both the masculine and the feminine type, and the joint participation of man and woman, working in their respective spheres, in the task of perfecting the social organization and advancing the natural culture."

MRS. HUMPHRY WARD ON SUFFRAGE.

Soon after her arrival in this country, late last March, Mrs. Humphry Ward expressed freely her views on the question of woman suffrage. The following is an extract from an interview with her, printed in the New York despatches of the Rochester N. Y., *Times*, March 25:

"There are really two suffrage movements in England. One dates from John Stuart Mill, and finds its supporters among a certain conservative class who are content to spread their propaganda in comparatively quiet, unobtrusive ways. This, which might be called the academic side of the question at issue, is hardly so revolutionary in its demands as the other and more recent movement. The latter appeals to a very much less educated class and has not hesitated to employ decidedly sensational methods for gaining popular support."

"You do not sympathize with either movement?"

"Woman's sphere of activity should be, and is being, enlarged. I am anything but an advocate of the old 'hearth-and-home' theory. But I think that what the suffragettes are fighting for is just what women do not need and should not have."

"They should not vote?"

"Not on questions in the solution of which they can never play a responsible part. Fancy a female general, a female admiral! Fancy a railroad run by women, roads built or mines worked by them! Well, if there is this inevitable physical limitation to a

woman's activity — if she can never enter the army or navy, never be a miner or a railroader — is it just that she be given a vote on matters that involve these activities?

"There are other questions, questions of an educational nature, and on these I believe women should be permitted to vote. The schools, the hospitals, the charities — to mention the most obvious — of a city or a nation are in the control of the government, and yet women have just as much of a responsible interest in these matters as men."

ANOTHER SUFFRAGE DEFEAT IN OREGON.

At the biennial state election in Oregon, June 1, a woman suffrage amendment to the constitution was submitted to the voters.

Under the initiative referendum in Oregon, all conditions favor those who seek changes in the constitution. They are only required to obtain the signatures of eight per cent of the voters to their petition to bring an amendment before the people; the state, at its own expense, mails their argument to every voter in the state; and to carry their proposition it is only required that they shall get the votes of a majority of the voters who vote upon that particular proposition, instead of, as in some states, a majority of the voters voting at the election.

The suffragists made an energetic campaign. To save themselves the trouble of procuring signatures to their petition, they went to the legislature of 1907 with a request for action for the direct submission of a suffrage amendment, but their request was refused. They therefore filed their petition January 15, and afterward made an active canvass of every county. Only four newspapers in the state, according to the *Woman's Journal*, opposed them. Yet their amendment was rejected at the polls by a majority of 20,405. These are the figures of the newspaper returns, up to June 10th subject to verification by the official count.

Three times within eight years a woman suffrage amendment has been submitted to the voters of Oregon.

In 1900, the majority against it was 1,966.

In 1906, the majority against it was 10,173.

In 1908 the majority against it was, in round numbers, 20,000.

Two points deserve consideration in this connection. One is that these figures afford no encouragement to the notion that a reluctant electorate can be wearied and harassed into granting suffrage by repeated attempts. The growing majorities against woman suffrage point to a growing irritation of the voters, and might well suggest to the legislature the wisdom of a provision that a proposed amendment, once submitted and rejected, shall not be again submitted until a reasonable time has elapsed.

The other point is that, as the same voters who rejected woman suffrage, voting under the local option law, voted against the saloons in nearly every county in the state, the charge that suffrage was defeated by the co-operation of anti-suffragists with the saloon interests is plainly preposterous.

The Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women warmly congratulates its sister association of Oregon upon the energy, intelligence, and devotion with which, in these three campaigns, it has opposed the suffragists and upon the victories which have crowned its exertions.

ENGLISH ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS.

It is reassuring to learn that the noisy activities of the "Suffragettes" have aroused the thoughtful and conservative women of England to opposition.

A London despatch of June 4 reports that a number of influential women, including the Countess of Jersey, Mrs. Humphry Ward, and several prominent writers and social reformers, have started an organized movement to oppose the granting of suffrage to women. The promoters say that they wish to combat the spirit of sex antagonism which the woman suffrage propaganda is arousing. They grant that women's work in municipal and local bodies has been valuable, but they protest against bestowing the parliamentary franchise upon them. They contend that the effectiveness of women's legislative power could not exceed the limits of the moral force exercised by their influence upon men. This influence,

they argue, is immense without a vote, and it would be lessened proportionately as women attempted to become the competitors and rulers of men.

NEW ANTI-SUFFRAGE ORGANIZATIONS.

The Guidon Study Club was organized in New York City last March for the purpose of promoting the study and discussion of the suffrage question. Mrs. Rossiter Johnson was chosen president; Mrs. Emil Kuichling and Mrs. Gilbert E. Jones, vice-presidents; Mrs. Julian Heath, secretary; and Mrs. Barclay Hazard, treasurer. It is intended to hold semi-monthly meetings. At the first of these, March 28, an address was given by the Rev. Henry H. Stebbins, D.D., on "The Family as a Social Unit." The headquarters of the club are at No. 61 Fifth Avenue.

The club has joined the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs and was represented at the May convention of women's clubs by Mrs. Johnson, who spoke briefly in opposition to woman suffrage in the time allotted to the suffrage question.

At the home of Mrs. Gilbert E. Jones, 222 Madison Avenue, May 13, the League for the Civic Education of Women, which is affiliated with the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, was organized. These officers were elected:

Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, president; Miss Eleanor Hewitt, Mrs. William Putnam, and Mrs. Samuel Untermyer, vice-presidents; Mrs. Gilbert E. Jones, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. F. S. Bangs, Miss Elizabeth Cockcroft, Mrs. Emil Kuichling, Mrs. John A. Church, Mrs. Barclay Hazard, Mrs. Julian Heath, Mrs. Rossiter Johnson, and Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, directors.

The league was formed, as its prospectus says, "for the purpose of giving the women of the state the best possible means of obtaining information bearing on their rights, responsibilities, and economic position in the community. Its object will be to make clear the reasons urged against the Woman Suffragists' movement by those actively opposing it, and to endeavor to get from the silent woman an expression of her opinion."

Next season there will be two courses of lectures, one at the Berkeley Lyceum and another at Cooper Union. Two members of the Cabinet of President Roosevelt, a number of United States Senators and members of the federal and state judiciary will be among the lecturers.